

Application No. 10/763,445
Amendment dated May 25, 2006
After Final Office Action of March 7, 2006

Docket No.: 66046-0007

REMARKS

Applicants have carefully reviewed the Office Action mailed March 7, 2006. Applicants would like to thank the Examiner for indicating that claims 7, 8, 19, 27, 34, and 60 would be patentable if rewritten in independent form. In response to the Office Action, Applicants have amended claims 1, 14, 16, 28, 41 and 60, cancelled claims 7, 19 and 49-58, and added new claims 67-76. Claims 2, 6, 10, 15, 21, 29, 32, 36, 40, and 42-48 were previously cancelled. By way of this amendment, no new matter has been added. Accordingly, claims 1, 3-5, 8, 9, 11-14, 16-18, 20, 22-28, 30, 31, 33, 35, 37-39, 41, 49-59, and 60-76 remain pending in this application. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the present application in view of the above amendment, the new claims, and the following remarks.

Claim Amendments

Claim 1 has been amended to incorporate the limitation of dependent claim 7, Claim 16 has been amended to incorporate the limitation of claim 19, and Claim 28 has been amended to incorporate the limitations of claim 34. Claim 60 has been amended to incorporate the limitation of independent claim 1 from the previous amendment dated January 25, 2006.

New claim 67 incorporates the limitations of claims 1 and 8, and new claim 68 incorporates the limitations of claims 16 and 27 from the previous amendment dated January 25, 2006. New claims 69-76, depending from independent claim 68, incorporate the limitations, respectively, of claims 17, 18, 20, and 22-26, which depend from independent claim 16.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 14, 16-20, 22-27 and 41 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

With regard to dependent claims 14 and 41, the Examiner notes that the limitations of “engaged by a clutch” are repetitive when read with their respective independent claims. Accordingly, these limitations were deleted from dependent claims 14 and 41. The Examiner has noted that claim 16 should have the phrase “the other” inserted after “rotational input in” to clearly distinguish the power path. Accordingly, “the other” has been added to claim 16.

Application No. 10/763,445
Amendment dated May 25, 2006
After Final Office Action of March 7, 2006

Docket No.: 66046-0007

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 102 / § 103

Claims 16-18, 20, 22-26, 28-31, 33, 35, 37-39, 62-66 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by *Komeda* '934. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Claims 1, 3-5, 9-14, 28-31, 35-41, 59, 61, 64 and 66 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by *Bowen* '291. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Claims 49 and 53 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by *Loeffler* '127. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Claims 54-58 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by *Schmidt* '757. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Claims 50-51 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Loeffler* as applied to claim 49 above, and further in view of *Hu* '455. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

The above rejections are respectfully traversed in light of the amendments presented herein. As indicated by the Examiner in the Office Action of March 7, 2006, independent claims 1, 16, 34, and 60, as amended, and new claims 67 and 68, are allowable. Additionally, and dependent claims 3-5, 8, 9, 11-14, 17-18, 20, 22-27, 30, 31, 33, 35, 37-39, 41, 49-59, 61-66, and 69-76 are allowable by being dependent on an allowable base claim.

Conclusion

In view of the above, each of the presently pending claims in this application is in immediate condition for allowance. If, however, there are any outstanding issues that can be resolved by telephone conference, the Examiner is earnestly encouraged to telephone the undersigned representative. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to pass this application to issue.

Applicant believes no fee is due with this response. However, if a fee is due, please charge our Deposit Account No. 18-0013, under Order No. 66046-0007 from which the undersigned is authorized to draw. To the extent necessary, a petition for extension of time

Application No. 10/763,445
Amendment dated May 25, 2006
After Final Office Action of March 7, 2006

Docket No.: 66046-0007

under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 is hereby made, the fee for which should also be charged to this Deposit Account.

Dated: May 25, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Michael B. Stewart

Registration No.: 36,018

Kenneth W. Jarrell

Registration No.: 52,484

RADER, FISHMAN & GRAUER PLLC

39533 Woodward Avenue

Suite 140

Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48304

(248) 594-0633

Attorneys for Applicant

R0344321.DOC